UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2609th MEETING: 30 SEPTEMBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2609)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 26 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17497); Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 568 (1985) (S/17453)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2609th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 30 September 1985, at 4 p.m.

President: Sir. John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2609)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 26 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17497);

   Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 568 (1985) (S/17453).

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 26 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17497);

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 568 (1985) (S/17453).

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Botswana in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Legwaila (Botswana) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 568 (1985) [*S/17453*]. Members of the Council also have before them the text of a draft resolution submitted by Botswana, Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago [*S/17503*].

3. The first speaker is the representative of Botswana, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Sir, the friendship between our two countries is so deep, so real and so meaningful that you can take it for granted that I am extremely pleased to see you as President of the Security Council in this very busy month of our United Nations year. Under your leadership we are confident that the Council will once again live up to our expectations. We also congratulate your predecessor for the skilful manner in which he presided over the deliberations of the Council last month.

5. We have come to the Security Council to perform a simple and straightforward task. We have come to ensure that our case against South Africa arising from that country's unprovoked and unwarranted attack against our capital on 14 June 1985 is pursued to its logical conclusion. The Council has before it the report of that tragic incident. Pursuant to resolution 568 (1985), the report confirms the very serious charges brought to the Council by my country against South Africa on 21 June [*2598th meeting*]. Unadorned and without any exaggeration, the report details all the facts about the incident as we saw them then and as seen and observed by the United Nations mission subsequently. In other words, the report is a simple and clear portrayal of what actually happened on the night of 14 June in the capital of the Republic of Botswana. The report is completely devoid of embellishments or cover-ups.

6. It is quite clear that the attack was unprovoked and unwarranted. Not only were the houses attacked scattered all over an open town but the victims, the refugee families who were murdered in cold blood, were found in their beds, asleep, as the bullet marks in the bedrooms have shown. None of those families was found armed and ready to defend itself as guerrillas would have been. And yet, in their pyjamas and natural state, they were brutally riddled with bullets and bombed to death in the most merciless fashion. The report confirms this fact.

7. The attack on our capital was, as the Council knows, blamed on the alleged use of our country by "ANC [*African National Congress of South Africa*] terrorists". It was alleged that our capital had become the nerve centre of the ANC's armed campaign against *apartheid* and that incidents that had occurred in places as distant as Cape Town

had originated in our capital. We have denied this preposterous allegation, for it is nothing but preposterous, given the location of our capital *vis-à-vis* the South African border. But what is even more supportive of our innocence is the very fact that since the attack on our capital the situation has gone from bad to worse in South Africa. A state of emergency has been declared in spite of the destruction of the "ANC nerve centre in Botswana". This proves quite conclusively that South Africa's problems are South African-made, and not a consequence of an external conspiracy. The ANC's guerrilla bases are in Soweto, Langa, Guguleto and all over South Africa, and not in foreign capitals, let alone the capital of Botswana.

8. Quite obviously, therefore, our capital was attacked unjustly on 14 June, and it is our right to demand compensation for the damage caused to life and property and for the very serious injury inflicted on the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of our country. The question of proving the culprit's culpability has never been an issue. Pretoria itself celebrated the brutal murder of the 14 June victims as soon as the heinous deed was done. So our case has been proved beyond all doubt, if any proving was ever necessary.

9. As paragraphs 83 and 84 of the Secretary-General's report attest, the invasion of our capital in the middle of the night was a traumatic experience for its inhabitants and refugees alike, besides the carnage it left in its wake. If our country is an island of peace and tranquillity, as it is well known to be, it is in many special ways personified by its capital situated so close to the edge of a seething volcano—not only an island of peace and tranquillity in the turbulence of southern Africa but, in addition, a show-piece of non-racial harmony so close to the citadel of racism.

10. Yet there is today in that capital a great deal of fear, and, understandably, gone is the unquestioning hospitality our capital had long been known to accord refugees from a South Africa to which we are inseperably joined by geography, history and culture. A gateway to freedom for victims of *apartheid*, the town of Gaborone is not about to abandon its humanitarian tradition, however; but it has been forced to be more circumspect in its generosity. Our refugee policy has not changed, but we have every reason to dread a repetition of the 14 June experience. We will never abandon our values and respect for the rule of law, but in carrying out our international obligations towards refugees, we should not and cannot be left to our own devices.

11. That is why we feel very strongly that the attack on our capital by South African commandos on 14 June was a serious challenge not only to our weak and powerless country but also to the international community as a whole. As the Secretary-General's report states:

> "At stake is the right of . . . asylum countries to be secure from attack or coercion by refugee producing countries." [*S/17453, para. 86.*]

Indeed, at stake is a fundamental principle cherished by all civilized humanity; the right of political asylum in peace and security. This is a right which we believe the international community has the obligation to defend and protect, for without it human civilization would suffer grievously.

12. We therefore expect to be assisted in strengthening our security if we are in turn expected to provide security for the refugees resident in our country. Security for the refugees is dependent on the security of the receiving State, and not the other way round. We know that with the kind of neighbour we have to the south of us it may not be possible for our country to be so secure as to be able to prevent acts of aggression such as that which was perpetrated against our capital on 14 June. But at least the international community must not be seen to be helpless in the face of a brutal violation of a régime of international treaties and conventions it holds so dear. For it would be tragic if the refugee-receiving countries were to be forced to seal their borders against refugees for fear of attacks by refugee-producing countries.

13. Our request for assistance, the report shows, is modest by any standard of measurement, given the enormity of the security problem we face in the strife-torn area which southern Africa has become. It is more than reasonable, for it has to be borne in mind that our country would not have had the slightest inclination to create refugee centres such as the Dukwe settlement, lost in the middle of nowhere, if we had no refugees to look after. It costs us a lot of money and manpower to provide security and other services for the Dukwe settlement, and we have neither: we have neither the manpower nor the money to do so.

14. So, every request for assistance we have made in this report is genuine and heartfelt. It is a direct consequence of the added burden imposed on our limited resources by the presence in our midst of so many refugees, victims of political circumstances who have sought asylum in our country.

15. South Africa has threatened to repeat its 14 June performance, and we take the threat very seriously indeed, since our country will always be a refugee-receiving country. We cannot change our values, and it is not our intention to do so. Our doors will always remain open for genuine victims of political circumstances, even as it is our earnest and cherished prayer and hope that reason and sanity will soon prevail in South Africa so that a new society, free and democratic, can see the light of day in that tortured land.

16. Let me conclude my statement by saying how deeply grateful we are to the Secretary-General for the report and for his forceful appreciation of the problems and quandaries of a front-line State. My country will forever be indebted to him for having dispatched to Botswana so promptly a mission composed of so dedicated and efficient a team of United Nations officials.

17. Let me also thank the Security Council in advance, since I have no reason to doubt that this draft resolution will be adopted unanimously. Let me thank the Council for the invaluable support it will render us and that it has

rendered us in the past in our hour of trial and tribulation. We thank you all very much indeed.

18. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): I should first like to discharge the pleasant duty of asking you, Mr. President, to transmit to Sir Geoffrey Howe, the Minister for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, our congratulations and profound gratitude for the exceptional way in which he conducted the work of our last meeting, which was held to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. I wish also to take this opportunity to tell you, Sir, how privileged we are to be holding our deliberations under your guidance once again.

19. As Chairman of the Group of African States, I should like to express to the Secretary-General our particular satisfaction for the diligence he displayed in dispatching a fact-finding mission to Botswana under the terms set forth in resolution 568 (1985). We should also like to thank the Government of Botswana for the assistance it provided the mission, thereby greatly facilitating its task.

20. It is not our intention to recall all the facts that led to this mission to Botswana. They are well known and were quite rightly condemned by the Council. Nevertheless, in analysing the report now before us our attention has been drawn to two particular points, namely, the economic burden created by the assistance being provided by the Government of Botswana to the refugees and the risk to its own security being run by that country because of the presence of those refugees on its territory. Those points deserve emphasis in order that we may better understand Botswana's concern at the current development of the situation inside South Africa.

21. Indeed, notwithstanding its economic problems, particularly those created by the drought, Botswana, because of its geographical situation and, as its representative has noted, its African traditions and its international and regional commitments, has found itself obliged to be a land of refugees for South Africans victims of *apartheid*. The Government of Botswana has just reaffirmed its allegiance to that policy in spite of the problems being encountered in satisfying the needs of those refugees and in spite of the threats and pressure being exercised by the racist régime of Pretoria to dissuade it from continuing.

22. We are all aware of the current practice to the South African authorities of attacking neighbouring independent States in an effort to camouflage its own internal troubles. Indeed, on 20 September last the Council condemned the South African racist régime for its premeditated and unwarranted armed attacks against the People's Republic of Angola. What assurances do we have that the same hostile acts will not be perpetrated tomorrow against another front-line State? Today, the threats are real and persistent, given the brutality with which the Pretoria forces of law and order daily repress anti-*apartheid* demonstrations, a brutality that may well produce a new influx of refugees into the countries bordering on South Africa.

23. It is in that context that we considered the report submitted by the mission to Botswana. The information furnished by the Government of Botswana is enlightening and demonstrates its determination to carry out its legal and humanitarian obligations and perform its moral duty towards those who have decided to suffer the atrocities of *apartheid* no more.

24. In this connection we should like to emphasize the following points: first, the commitment of the Government of Botswana to continue, as a signatory of the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees signed at Geneva in 1951[1] and the Convention of the Organization of African Unity Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa concluded at Addis Ababa in 1969[2], to honour its obligations as a State of asylum; secondly, the co-operation between the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Government of Botswana in order to strengthen and improve the census of refugees; thirdly, Botswana's concern regarding the security of South African refugees, who are vulnerable targets of acts of reprisal on the part of the racist police forces of Pretoria; fourthly, the desire to improve the capacity of refugee settlements in the Dukwe region and in other large towns of the country, including the capital.

25. We are grateful to the Government of Botswana for the tremendous efforts it has made to ensure the safety and well-being of the refugees residing in its country despite an unfavourable, if not hostile, economic and political environment. It is now our duty to decide on the assistance the international community can give Botswana to help it step up its capacity to receive and shelter South African refugees. Our recommendation is that the Council endorse the recommendations and conclusions in the mission's report. The damage and loss of human life involved in the unprovoked attack by South Africa against Gaborone have been assessed. We have to make sure that the Pretoria régime makes reparation for that damage and the other harm that has resulted as a result of its act of aggression committed on 14 June 1985. Furthermore, the competent bodies of the United Nations should also, each within its respective purview, participate in that assistance to the Government of Botswana.

26. It is in that spirit that the delegations of Botswana, Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago and Madagascar have sponsored the draft resolution in document S/17503.

27. The solution to the problems of southern African can only be found through the elimination of the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. South African refugees will continue to be scattered throughout the countries of that region of Africa as long as acts of brutality and violence remain the daily lot of the long-suffering people of South Africa. We believe that the Council should react forthrightly to the sort of situation that has just been experienced by Botswana, as is emphasized in the conclusion of the mission's report:

> "At stake is the right of refugee asylum countries to be secure from attack or coercion by refugee producing countries: this is a fundamental principle of the interna-

tionally agreed régime of international treaties and conventions dealing with refugees." [*Ibid.*]

28. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/17503. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 572 (1985)].

29. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this meeting. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, No. 2545.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 1001, No. 14691.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—January 1995—1,925

S/PV.
2610

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2610th MEETING: 2 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2610)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17509)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2610th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 2 October 1985, at 11:50 a.m.

President: Mr. Herbert S. OKUN
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2610)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17509)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of October, I should like at the very outset to pay tribute, on behalf of the members of the Council, to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Sir Geoffrey Howe, and to Sir John Thomson, representative of the United Kingdom, for their service as President of the Council for the month of September. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing to them our admiration and deep appreciation for the great diplomatic skill with which they conducted the business of the Council last month.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17509)

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Tunisia and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Caïd (Tunisia) and Mr. Netanyahu (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahariya) and Mr. Türkmen (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 2 October 1985 from the representative of Egypt [*S/17512*], which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to Mr. Farouq Qaddoumi, Head of the Political Department and Member of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in accordance with the Council's past practice, in connection with the Council's consideration of the item presently on its agenda."

4. The proposal by the representative of Egypt is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of the Security Council, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when it was invited to participate under rule 37.

5. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

6. Since no member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall make the following statement in my capacity as the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

7. The United States has consistently taken the position that under the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39.

8. For 39 years the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39 and would certainly not have objected had this matter been raised under that rule. We are, however, opposed to special *ad hoc* departures from orderly procedure.

9. The United States consequently opposes extending to the PLO the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Council as if that organization represented a Member State. We certainly believe in listening to all

points of view, but none of that requires violating the rules. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Council which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules.

10. For these reasons, the United States requests that the terms of the proposed invitation be put to the vote. The United States will of course vote against the proposal.

11. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

12. If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal bv Egypt.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Farouq Qaddoumi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

13. The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 2 October 1985 from the representative of Kuwait [*S/17513*], which reads as follows:

> "In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of October, I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the discussion in the Council of the item presently on its agenda."

14. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Maksoud.

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 1 October 1985 from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Council [*S/17509*].

16. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, Mr. Béji Caïd Essebsi. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

17. Mr. CAÏD ESSEBSI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to wish you success in your task. I should have preferred to discharge this agreeable duty in happier circumstances, such as the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization. Unfortunately, the act of aggression of which my country has just been the innocent victim has changed all that. I venture to hope that under your presidency the Council will fulfil the noble mission entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations—that of the maintenance of international peace and security.

18. The Council has before it an official communication from my Government describing in detail an act of aggression against Tunisia for which Israel has officially claimed responsibility. That act of aggression resulted in the loss of many human lives, which initial estimates put at more than 60 dead and more than 100 injured. Furthermore, it caused material damage and destruction on a large scale.

19. Contrary to what Israeli officials are claiming, the place chosen for this cowardly attack is situated in an exclusively residential urban area which has traditionally been the home of Tunisian families and a small number of Palestinian civilians who had to flee from Lebanon following the invasion of that country by the Israeli army.

20. The Israeli raid constitutes a blatant act of aggression against the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Tunisia and a flagrant violation of the rules and norms of international law, as well as the principles set fort in the Charter.

21. Nothing can justify this act of terrorism committed by and duly acknowledged by the Government of a Member State against another Member State, Tunisia, which has so often unequivocally condemned terrorism of every kind and from whatever source. Countries that have denounced State terrorism and declared their determination to combat it cannot but join forces within the Security Council to take appropriate measures in response to this crime. Any attempt to justify it, any indulgence shown to its perpetrators, no matter what the pretext, can only encourage aggression and set the seal of approval on the aggressor. In any case, my country would have no alternative but to consider that an unfriendly gesture, from which it would draw the necessary conclusions.

22. Indeed, Tunisia has unfailingly denounced aggression, condemned the aggressor and assured the victim of its active sympathy. We did so when it was United States nationals who were the victims. We did so when it was French nationals who were the victims. And we do so today in this chamber, as we pay our respects to the memory of the Soviet citizen who was the victim in Lebanon of blind violence and the deterioration of a situation with which the aggressor against Tunisia today is not unconnected.

23. The crime is particularly reprehensible because in fact it is aimed at jeopardizing the tireless efforts exerted by the peace-loving countries to bring about a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian problem on the basis of the principles of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions. Everyone is aware that the hospitality extended by Tunisia to the Palestinian leadership falls within that framework. In any case, no act of terrorism has been committed from Tunisia, and no Tunisian has ever been implicated in any such act.

24. Tunisia's aim in inviting the Council to condemn vigorously both the deliberation act of aggression and its perpetrators, and to demand that they make just and full reparation for all damage caused, is not merely to seek the sanctions imposed by international legality and morality; we are also calling upon the Council to declare its determination to avert and prevent any repetition of such acts of terrorism committed by a Member State. We are attempting also to preserve the chances for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, which Israel is clearly attempting to undermine.

25. The Tunisian Government is confident that the Council will give its utmost attention to the grave situation created by the act of aggression planned and carried out by the Israeli Government against the sovereignty of Tunisia and peace in the region, and that it will adopt the necessary resolutions.

26. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Deputy Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. You represent a country which, in its capacity as a permanent member of the Council, has a special role to play in the maintenance of international peace and security. In addition, your wide experience and outstanding abilities will enable you to accomplish your task with great competence.

28. I pay a tribute also to your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, the representative of the United Kingdom, for the wisdom and competence with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

29. May I thank the Council for allowing me to participate in the debate on the item now under discussion, on behalf of the Arab countries, in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States this month.

30. The Council is meeting today to discuss a new act of aggression by the Zionist entity, which has no regard whatsoever for the sanctity of international laws and norms. This act of aggression is now added to the very long list of the continuous series of Israeli acts of aggression directed not only against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring and non-neighbouring Arab States, but also against the rules of international conduct to which the civilized nations that belong to the United Nations should be committed.

31. The brutal air raid against the Tunisian capital is a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of Tunisia, a sister Arab country, as well as of the integrity of its skies and land. It is also an open act of aggression against the Charter of the United Nations, which guarantees the sovereignty of States and their territorial integrity, and against the international laws that disapprove such illegal international behaviour, and indeed against ethics, which normally constitues the major moral arbiter in the relations among those nations that respect the Charter and cherish the sanctity of international laws.

32. The Arab States strongly condemn this blatant aggression and declare their total solidarity with and full support for the sister State of Tunisia.

33. It is indeed ironic that this aggressive Zionist entity, which had an illegitimate birth, should persist in committing illegal acts of aggression and crimes with a total disregard for all international laws and norms represented by the world Organization which had a major helping hand in its creation.

34. Since that alien entity was implanted in the midst of Arab lands and Arab countries, we have seen that the colonialist way of thinking—from which the idea of creating such an entity, which could not be anything but a byproduct of colonialism, originated—still constitutes the cornerstone of the way of thinking and the behaviour of the rulers in Tel Aviv, who have made a habit of not allowing the slightest legal or ethical motive to stand in the way of their ambitions and cyclical policies of aggression. In addition to the iron-fist policy by which they rule the population of the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories, we find them from time to time striking out at secure, independent and sovereign Arab States, in a desperate effort to reaffirm their adherence to the colonialist theories and traditions which the world Organization seeks to eliminate for good.

35. Like similar acts of aggression against the sovereignty of other Arab countries, the Israeli air raid against the Tunisian capital summarizes the way of thinking of Zionist colonialism, which in no circumstances whatsoever allows the slightest check to its ambitions and objectives; it is a way of thinking which embodies the idea that all means are acceptable and should be used, including the stretching of the long arm of aggression, to attack the sanctity of independent and sovereign States on pretexts which only the kind of sick logic used by Israel and its supporters could accept.

36. The limitless arrogance of the Zionist entity, which is a natural extension of the extinct colonial era, would not be displayed but for the fact that that entity is sure that it can do with impunity whatever it wants, no matter how much it is in violation of international laws and norms.

Indeed, its experience of the international community over the past four decades confirms that painful fact.

37. The strange immunity enjoyed by that unique entity is the product of two separate phenomena that do not augur well, to say the least. The first is the paralysis of the political will of the international community, which should have proved its effectiveness by stopping the advance of that dangerous colonialist octopus at the first signs of its rebellious behaviour, directed against the very organization that participated in its creation. The second phenomenon is the protection provided by some countries that participated in the creation of the Zionist entity and are still playing a part in transforming it into a fearsome monster by supplying it with all the means of power, arrogance and rebelliousness in the form of vast military and economic assistance, completely unjustifiable by its size and despite its conduct in that sensitive part of the world. Moreover, such assistance, coupled with full political support, continues to be given even when the Zionist entity commits acts of aggression that violate international laws and norms.

38. We saw that happen in the aftermath of the recent criminal raid on the Tunisian capital, when the United States announced that that heinous Israeli crime was justified and concurred with the Israeli argument that the crime had been committed in self-defence, without any reference whatsoever to the aggression against Tunisia's sovereignty, carried out by aircraft manufactured in the United States. It seems that United States officials, who repeatedly announced during the hijacking of the TWA airliner that retaliation against that terrorist act would in itself constitute a terrorist act, have changed their minds and are now saying "As a matter of policy, retaliation against terrorist acts is a legitimate response and an expression of self-defence".

39. We are convinced that the Israeli crime falls within the category of official State terrorism. Israeli has made unrelenting efforts to destroy all traces of the PLO, the some legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, wherever it is to be found. It has done so through its invasion of Lebanon, with all its terrible consequences, such as the murder of thousands of innocent people, the destruction of cities and villages and even the siege of the Lebanese capital; by its adoption of policies of coercion and repression against the populations of the occupied territories, where people are deported from the land of their forefathers merely on suspicion of having connections with the PLO, in flagrant violation of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention;[1] and, indeed, by the barbaric raid on the PLO headquarters in the Tunisian capital, involving the murder of innocent people in a heavily populated, civilian area.

40. All those actions point in the same direction—to the Zionist design to usurp the remaining Arab land of Palestine by perpetrating various crimes aimed at the Judaization of those lands after the eviction of their Arab population, and eventually taking possession of them, in violation of the Charter principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

41. According to the settler-colonial way of thinking of the Zionist entity, such a design can be realized only by destroying the institutions of the Palestinian people, notably the PLO, whether by striking at those institutions at any time and any place, wherever they may be, regardless of any encroachment on the sovereignty and security of the Arab countries concerned, or by describing the PLO as a terrorist organization in order to pass off any attack on it as a legitimate act, a term used by the friends of Israel in such cases, despite the recognition by an absolute majority of Member States that the PLO is, and remains, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

42. Had the Zionists read history, they would have come across a well-known fact which has been well learned by the former colonial Powers after they had paid dearly for it—that attempts to suppress peoples or destroy liberation movements by brute force, no matter what name is given to those attempts, are fruitless, and that victory always crowns the struggle of the oppressed peoples.

43. To justify the crime committed against the sovereignty of our sister State of Tunisia, Israel and its friends now say that the attack was directed against the PLO and not against Tunisia. In the past, in order to justify the barbaric Israeli invasion of Lebanon, they said that it was meant to protect the northern Israeli settlements. Now, since Palestinians are to be found in innumerable Arab and non-Arab countries all over the world, because of their dispersal by the Zionist entity and as a result of the creation of that entity, does that mean that those countries—no matter how many they are or how far away they are from the Zionist entity—are potential targets of Israeli aggression whenever that appeals to the rulers in Tel Aviv, and that the long arm of the Israeli forces, as the Defence Minister of the Zionist entity announced yesterday, will reach them wherever they are?

44. We should like to put the following question to those who follow such logic: if the barbaric and beastly acts that you are trying to pass off as legitimate self-defence can indeed be regarded as such, why was there any need to have a Charter and why is there a need for the Charter to affirm the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States? We also ask Israel and those who concur with its twisted logic: where would the Israeli forces draw the line in acting in self-defence? The Charter was adopted in order to be implemented, in order to save the world from just such Nazi or Fascist way of thinking, which gives those who follow it absolute freedom to act with total disregard for the sovereignty and security of other States.

45. When Israel insists on not abiding by relevant United Nations resolutions, which express the will of the international community, the Council has a duty to discuss taking appropriate measures under the Charter in order to ensure that Israel abides by those resolutions.

46. Israel's sense of total impunity in its indifference to international law and its disregard of relevant United Nations resolutions is organically connected with the Council's failure to assert itself as the body responsible for

the maintenance of international peace and security, which have been often subjected to upheavals as a result of Israel's continued efforts to challenge the power of the international community. The Council's failure is organically connected also with the efforts of certain States to protect Israel from the anger of the international community whenever the Zionist entity commits a new act of aggression against an Arab country or against the norms of international law.

47. The international community has become a true expert on Zionist strategy and on the twisted behaviour of the Zionist entity. Everyone knows perfectly well that whenever Israel feels the pinch of pressure from peace efforts it simply commits a military act in order to blow to pieces any initiative or other effort to push it in the direction of peace. It wants land without people, and it therefore insists on continuing its efforts to upset all peaceful initiatives to reach a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We could almost believe that this was among Israel's basic reasons for committing this act of aggression against fraternal Tunisia.

48. The Arab countries strongly condemn and denounce this latest act of aggression and affirm that they stand by Tunisia in confronting this brutal act of Zionist aggression. They join their voices to those of other nations in calling on the Security Council to should its responsibilities and carry out its basic task of maintaining world peace. The Council must condemn Israel, which is seeking to impose its will in contravention of all international law and conventions, and must restore what the United Nations has lost in prestige as a result of Israel's disregard of the collective will of the international community in all matters relating to the Middle East.

49. The Arab States appeal to the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution to be submitted by Tunisia. That, we believe, is the least the Council can do if it intends to play its role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

50. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate your delegation on its assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October, which coincides with the culmination of the commemorative ceremonies marking the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, and during which month the Council also has to address a number of urgent and important questions. Our two countries have friendly and co-operative relations in diverse fields, and the ties that bind our two peoples are many. We are both now engaged in new efforts to give more positive content to our relationship. Let me add, Sir, that your own diplomatic skills and wide experience are well known. I have therefore much pleasure in extending to you my personal greetings.

51. We should like also to convey our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of the United Kingdom, for the very able manner in which he guided our work last month. Our warm tribute goes also to Sir Geoffrey Howe, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, for the skill with which he presided over the commemorative meeting of the Security Council held on 26 September.

52. The Council is meeting yet again, at the request of a fellow non-aligned country, to consider the latest acts of aggression and terrorism committed by Israel, this time against Tunisia, a friendly and peace-loving country. It is ironic that we should be meeting under these tragic circumstances so soon after our commemorative meeting of 26 September, at which we unanimously reaffirmed our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and undertook to fulfil with renewed dedication and determination our individual and collective responsibility for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace.

53. The ready response of Council members in agreeing to the request by Tunisia for an urgent Council meeting to condemn this act of deliberate aggression, to demand reparations, and to take measures to prevent other such acts bears witness to our sensitivity to the grave challenge posed by the latest Israeli action.

54. We have listened with great attention—and, I might add, anguish—to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia and to the statement made by the Deputy Premier of Kuwait, who was speaking on behalf of the Arab delegations. Those statements have given a detailed account of the unjustified and blatant Israeli attack against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a sovereign Member State, Tunisia. This attack is yet another glaring entry in the lengthy catalogue of Israel's aggressive policies designed to intimidate its Arab neighbours with the threat and use of massive force. It has been condemned world-wide; we join in that condemnation.

55. The attack is one more manifestation of Israel's desire to eliminate the heroic Palestinian resistance against it and to consolidate its stranglehold on the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. Such actions by the Israeli authorities are in flagrant violation of the norms of international law and the purposes and principles of the Charter. They also serve to delay the prospects of peace in the region.

56. The Israeli attack against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia was comprehensively discussed at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of Non-Aligned Countries to the General Assembly at its fortieth session, held yesterday, 1 October, at United Nations Headquarters. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation noted with indignation and grave concern the serious acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel. In the special communiqué adopted by the meeting,

> "They strongly condemned Israel for its barbaric, cold-blooded and totally unjustified attack on Tunisia, in flagrant violation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The target of the attack was the premises of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in a vain

attempt to destroy the heroic Palestinian resistance. They expressed deep distress at the heavy loss of life among Tunisian and Palestinian civilians and damage to property and affirmed their sympathy, solidarity and support to the Government and people of Tunisia and the PLO in the face of this aggression." [*see S/17518, annex.*]

57. At the meeting, sentiment was overwhelmingly against the latest instance of aggression and State terrorism by Israel, which testifies to its arrogance and intransigence and to its utter lack of respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation further renewed the call repeatedly made by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter.

58. Grave concern is being expressed over the escalating cycle of violence in the Middle East. It should be clear to all by now—and we hope it is—that there can be no end to violence without peace, and peace cannot be achieved except through a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem. The fundamental principles of, and the basic framework for, such a solution already exist in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez [*see S/15510 of 6 December 1982, annex*] and the pronouncements adopted at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983 [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex*].

59. Those well-recognized fundamental principles are: first, that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the problem of the Middle East and no solution to that problem can be envisaged without taking into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; secondly, that the exercise of those inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and property and to exercise their right to self-determination, including the establishment of a State of their own, will contribute to a final solution of the Middle East crisis; thirdly, that the participation on an equal footing of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, is indispensable to all efforts to find a solution to the Middle East problem; and, fourthly, that no just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be established without the withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories that it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and without the guarantee that all States of the region can live within secure and recognized borders.

60. Those fundamental principles were reiterated and endorsed at the recently concluding Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda in September of this year [*see S/17610 and Corr.1, annex*]. The Ministers further decided to call for a meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in the Middle East, including the question of Palestine, during the early part of the current fortieth session of the General Assembly.

61. We emphasize the importance of the early convening of the proposed international conference on peace in the Middle East if comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East is to be secured. In this context, we attach considerable importance to the forthcoming meeting of the Security Council requested by my delegation on behalf of the non-aligned countries, in pursuance of the decision taken at Luanda.

62. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries attaches paramount importance to the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is well known that the primary reason for the lack of progress in finding a comprehensive solution is the arrogance and intransigence of Israel, which has deliberately defied the will of the international community. Israel's policies and practices over the years in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and against its Arab neighbours have posed a serious threat to international peace and security. The time has come for the international community to raise its voice in outrage against these policies and to restrain Israel from such actions.

63. The Security Council should take action to deal with the specific action by Israel with which we are at present faced, which undoubtedly is a breach of international law and of the Charter by Israel. I trust that the Council will demonstrate the will to act immediately and resolutely.

64. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, the beginning of which finds us in a difficult situation. However, we are convinced that, with your well-known skill you will guide the work of the Council and preside over our deliberations with efficiency, as the United States delegation always has.

65. I should also like to express my thanks and appreciation to the representative of the United Kingdom, who presided over the work of the Council during a very busy month in which it held what I do not think I exaggerate in calling an historic meeting. We look forward to the next few years, during which we shall understand, accept and absorb the statements delivered at that historic meeting.

66. Yesterday the Middle East region witnessed a very dangerous escalation of tension and a major threat. Tension has suddenly escalated because of the treacherous raid carried out by the Israeli air force against the Tunisian capital.

67. Egypt strongly and clearly condemns that brutal act of aggression by Israel against a sister State and states that it is a clear violation of all the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It is a flagrant challenge to the United Nations and all its international institutions. The Israeli air raid was an effort to undermine the framework within which the Middle East is trying to move towards peace, and demonstrates Israel's excessive violence. Instead of moving towards a peaceful settlement

of the core of the conflict in the Middle East, Israel is attempting to undermine the possibility of achieving peace.

68. Israel has declared that it undertook its heinous act in order to pursue those responsible for the killing of three Israeli citizens in Larnaca, Cyprus, even though, immediately after the incident, the PLO declared that it was not responsible for that act, which Egypt naturally denounced.

69. Despite that declaration by the PLO, Israel undertook the raid, for which it had paved the way a short time ago. Everyone knows of the two letters sent by the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General in which he mentioned "Force 17" of the PLO, which he said was responsible for many acts of violence against Israel. The first letter, dated 4 September 1985 [*S/17438*], mentioned "Force 17" and said that it and its leaders were present in Jordan; it also mentioned a so-called group of terrorists said to be in Algeria and on its way to Israel. The second letter, dated 27 September [*S/17502*], accused Force 17 of the acts that took place in Larnaca. The representative of Jordan mentioned earlier references in which Israel warned the sister country of Jordan that it would undertake acts against Jordan because that Palestinian force had its headquarters in Jordan.

70. My country believes that such acts against the Palestinian people, wherever they take place, strengthen the circle of violence and extremism, at a time when all peace-loving peoples in the world are trying to achieve a lasting and peaceful settlement of the dispute in the Middle East. My delegation believes that this new act of aggression by Israel against the PLO headquarters in Tunisia will only increase feelings of hatred and anarchy in a region that is in dire need of efforts to establish peace and stability. Unfortunately, it seems that Israel has not learned the lesson of Lebanon, that is, that violence only breeds violence; it has not learned that it is not possible to eliminate the PLO or its leadership.

71. Egypt cannot understand the position of some that see Israel's right to revenge for its citizens when it undertakes actions that kill innocent people or when it threatens the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States. The current situation prevailing in the Middle East cannot be settled by such acts of aggression.

72. Egypt declares that it stands by the people and the Government of Tunisia; it stands by the Palestinian people in its struggle to achieve its inalienable rights. Egypt expects the Security Council to take a firm position in dealing with this situation and with this heinous Israeli attack, which has been condemned on the widest international scale.

73. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

74. Mr. QADDOUMI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure at the outset of my statement to extend my thanks and appreciation to the Council and to its members that voted in favour of the decision to address an invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the Council's deliberations on the brutal Israeli act of aggression against sister Tunisia and against the offices of the PLO.

75. At a time when the United Nations is commemorating its fortieth anniversary, Israel has committed a new act of aggression, which this time was directed against Tunisian territory in violation of the sovereignty of that sister country, a Member State of the United Nations. That criminal act of aggression has claimed the lives of hundreds of Tunisians and Palestinians.

76. At the same time, the forces of Israeli occupation persist in their most heinous forms of oppression and repression of Arab citizens within the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories.

77. It is neither a surprise nor a coincidence that this act of aggression has coincided with a similar raid launched by the forces of the other racist régime, in South Africa, against the militant people of Angola, and that in both instances the United States has supported and justified those acts of aggression.

78. It is truly regrettable that the United States claims in another context that it is fighting international terrorism while it justifies the Israeli act of aggression and protects Israel from the sanctions it deserves under international law for such crimes. Were those planes and bombs not manufactured in the United States, and were they not provided to Israel under a strategic alliance between the two countries?

79. By committing that crime, Israel has reaffirmed its hostility towards peace and its insistence on undermining all international efforts to preserve peace in the Middle East, the area to which we belong. The United States, by supporting and justifying that act of aggression, reveals its lack of credibility and lack of seriousness in playing any constructive role in the international endeavours under way to establish a lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

80. The PLO has on numerous occasions expressed its sincere desire for peace by its acceptance of United Nations resolutions and its commitment to international legality as a basis for a just solution to the Middle East crisis. But by their intransigence and their rejection of international initiatives, Israel and the United States have foreclosed all avenues of peace. The Israeli act of aggression has unveiled the real intentions of Israel, which are hostile to peace. Moreover, the United States position in support of the Israeli act of aggression will definitely contribute to an increase of tension in the area. It will also increase the prospect of war and hostilities.

81. We no longer have any illusions as to the United States position, which impedes efforts towards peace. It is therefore incumbent upon the international community fully to shoulder its responsibilities. It is high time that the

necessary sanctions and punitive measures be imposed by all available means to protect the international peace and security so jeopardized by Israel's policy of aggression and expansion and by the United States' total alignment with that policy.

82. Israel claims—and its claims, regrettably, are supported by the United States—that it perpetrated its most recent crime on Tunisian territory in retaliation to Palestinian acts of resistance. Here, we must ask: Is Israel's occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories and its depriving the Palestinian people of their basic rights under the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the Organization not an act of terrorism? Are the actions of the Israeli occupation army against Palestinian citizens, actions that run the whole gamut of oppression, murder, torture, imprisonment and arbitrary detention, not in themselves blatant examples of State terrorism? Are the Fascist acts of the Zionist settlers who storm Palestinian homes, shoot the occupants, seize and confiscate their properties and displace the inhabitants from their homeland not acts of terrorism? In the face of all this, is it not the right of the Palestinian people to resist such systematic Israeli State terrorism? The right to self-defence and to defence of the homeland are legitimate rights acknowledged under international laws and norms for all the peoples of the world.

83. If Israel believes that it can, through its terrorism, subjugate the Palestinian people and continue to usurp their national rights, it is indulging in self-delusion. History has proved that the will of peoples is invincible. Despite all the suffering of our Palestinian people for 70 years under colonialism and occupation, that people are still increasing their resistance and consolidating their will to attain the freedom and independence of their homeland.

84. It would have been more becoming had the United States acted with a sense of its responsibility as a major Power and had it, rather than justifying an act of aggression, closely examined the root causes of the Israeli-Arab conflict, at the very core of which is the question of Palestine. Unfortunately, however, the United States persists in disregarding the causes of this conflict and in its denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people. It is high time the United States recognized and acknowledged the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination on its own national soil, as well as the fact that the PLO is not a transient phenomenon but a firm reality in the life of the Palestinian people, expressing that people's will and national aspirations, and that it enjoys complete support at the Palestinian, Arab and international levels.

85. Those who seek or claim to seek a lasting peace in the Middle East must recognize those facts and deal with them in the light of the many resolutions adopted by the international community, the most recent of which was the resolution calling for the convening of an international conference within the framework of the United Nations at which the super-Powers, the PLO and all other parties concerned would participate on an equal footing.

86. If the Israeli raid is a response to our recent initiatives seeking to achieve a just and peaceful solution to the problem, then let Israel and the United States know that such terrorism will not intimidate us, nor will it discourage us from continuing the struggle through all legitimate means until our Palestinian people have wrested their inalienable national rights and returned to their homeland.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTE

[1]Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973).

Litho

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

o in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925